

1 JAMES V. FITZGERALD, III (State Bar No. 55632)
 2 NOAH G. BLECHMAN (State Bar No. 197167)
 3 J. GARRET DEAL (State Bar No. 249934)
 4 McNAMARA, DODGE, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY,
 5 PFALZER, BORGES & BROTHERS LLP
 6 1211 Newell Avenue
 7 Post Office Box 5288
 8 Walnut Creek, CA 94596
 9 Telephone: (925) 939-5330
 10 Facsimile: (925) 939-0203

11 Attorneys for Defendant
 12 JASON INGRASSIA

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 ABHINAV BHATNAGAR,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 JASON INGRASSIA, individually and in
 15 his official capacity; COUNTY OF
 16 CONTRA COSTA; and CITY OF SAN
 17 RAMON,

18 Defendants.

Case No. C07-02669 CRB (EDL)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL
 RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST
 SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS ON
 DEFENDANT INGRASSIA**

Date: August 26, 2008
 Time: 9:30 a.m.
 Dept: Courtroom E, 15th Floor
 Judge: Honorable Elizabeth Laporte

18 On August 26, 2008, at 9:30 a.m., Plaintiff ABHINAV BHATNAGAR'S ("Plaintiff")
 19 motion to compel responses to Plaintiff's first set of discovery requests on Defendant JASON
 20 INGRASSIA ("Defendant") came on regularly for hearing. After full consideration of the
 21 briefing, the arguments of Plaintiff's and defense counsel, and the pleadings on file on this case,
 22 the Court hereby DENIES Plaintiff's motion in its entirety.

23 Plaintiff moved to compel Defendant to verify his responses to Plaintiff's interrogatories
 24 and to further respond to Plaintiff's interrogatories and document requests regarding Defendant's
 25 personal telephone number(s), his positions within the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office
 26 ("CCCSO"), the actions Defendant's employer took in response to Plaintiff's complaint, and
 27 Defendant's training, disciplinary history and financial status.

28 [PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
 TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST SET OF
 DISCOVERY REQUESTS ON DEFENDANT INGRASSIA
 C07-02669 CRB (EDL)

1 Defendant verified his interrogatory responses on August 6, 2008. This issue is
2 accordingly moot.

3 County of Contra Costa, a separate Defendant and Ingrassia's employer, recently
4 produced documents responsive to Plaintiff's document requests, subject to minor redactions of
5 irrelevant and private information and/or information pertaining to non-parties, including
6 Ingrassia's personnel file and the Internal Affairs investigation relating to Plaintiff's complaint.
7 This production accordingly satisfies Defendant Ingrassia's discovery obligations. Also, Plaintiff
8 is not entitled to Ingrassia's personal telephone number, which is highly private given his status
9 as a peace officer, and Plaintiff's request to inquire into Defendant's financial status is premature
10 at this time. Plaintiff's interrogatories also exceed the numerical limits of Federal Rule of Civil
11 Procedure ("FRCP") 33(a) because they contain discrete subparts. Plaintiff is directed to seek
12 leave of Court before propounding additional interrogatories on Defendant. FRCP 33(a);
13 Northern District of California Local Rule 33-3.

14 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is DENIED in its entirety.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: _____

17 HON. ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
18 United States Magistrate Judge